

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT**

PRIVATE
ENDC/PV.2
15 March 1962
ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 6 1963

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 15 March 1962, at 10 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. GREEN

(Canada.)

62-08447

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. SAN THIAGO DANTAS
Mr. C.A. BERNARDES
Mr. RODRIGUES RIBOS
Mr. de ARAUJO CASTRO

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LOUCANOV
Mr. M. TARABANOV
Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. V. PALINE

Burma:

U Thi HAN
Mr. J. BARRINGTON
U Tin MAUNG
U Aye LWIN

Canada:

Mr. H. GREEN
Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. J.E.G. HARDY
Mr. J.F.M. BELL

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. DAVID
Mr. J. HAJEK
Mr. E. PEPICH
Mr. M. ZEMLA

Ethiopia:

Mr. K. YIFRU
Mr. T. GEBREGZY
Mr. A. MANDEFRO
Mr. M. HAMID

India:

Mr. V.K. KRISHNA MENON
Mr. M.J. DESAI
Mr. A.S. LALL
Mr. A.S. MEHTA

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

Italy:

Mr. A. SEGNI
Mr. C. RUSSO
Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. F. SENSI

Mexico:

Mr. L. PADILLA NERVO
Mr. E. CALDERON PUIG
Miss E. AGUIRRE
Mr. S. GONZALEZ-GALVEZ

Nigeria:

Mr. J. WACHUKU
Mr. A.A. ATTA
Mr. A. HAASTRUP
Mr. V.N. CHIBUNDU

Poland:

Mr. A. RAPACKI
Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI
Mr. M. LACHS
Mr. M. BIEN

Romania:

Mr. O. MANESCU
Mr. G. MACOVESCU
Mr. C. SANDRU
Mr. M. MALITZA

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL
Baron C.H. von PLATEN
Mr. G.A. WESTRING
Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. A.A. GROMYKO
Mr. V.A. ZORIN
Mr. V.S. SEMENOV
Mr. V.P. SUSLOV

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

United Arab Republic:

Mr. M. FAWZI

Mr. A.F. HASSAN

Mr. A. TALAAT

Mr. M.S. AHMED

United Kingdom:

The Earl of Home

Mr. J.B. GODBER

Sir Michael WRIGHT

Mr. J.S.H. SHATTOCK

United States of America:

Mr. D. RUSK

Mr. A.H. DEAN

Mr. W.C. FOSTER

Mr. C. BOHLEN

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. O. LOUTFI

Deputies to the Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. T.G. NARAYANAN

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Canada): The second meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament is called to order.

I have two speakers on the list for today: the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America.

Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): A little more than two years have passed since the day when, from the rostrum of the United Nations, the Head of the Soviet Government, N.S. Krushchev, appealed to the whole world for general and complete disarmament. In this historically brief period of time, the idea of general and complete disarmament has not only gripped the imagination of people, but has also definitely rallied hundreds of millions of people under its banner. It is no exaggeration to say that today the largest army in the world is the army of the advocates of general and complete disarmament, and its ranks are being reinforced every year, every month.

Is not the vitality of this idea shown by the fact that following upon its unanimous approval by the Fourteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly, the Sixteenth Session, held last autumn, instructed the Eighteen Nation Committee especially set up for this purpose, to work out an agreement on general and complete disarmament?

Long before the Chairman's gave^d opened the meetings of our Committee, the Soviet Government made endeavours with a view to ensuring the fruitful nature of the negotiations on disarmament. It was precisely concern for a successful outcome to the negotiations that inspired the message of the Head of the USSR Government, N.S. Krushchev, to the leading statesmen of the member countries of the Eighteen Nation Committee, in which he proposed that the work of the Committee should begin at the highest level, with the participation of Heads of Government or Chiefs of State. This initiative of the Soviet Union has greatly contributed to the realization of the importance of the disarmament negotiations now beginning.

Today everyone recognizes the personal responsibility of the Heads of Government and Chiefs of State for the success of these negotiations and the need for the direct participation of statesmen of the highest rank in the work of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament. No less important is the fact that the activities of the Committee on Disarmament are now the focus of world

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

public opinion. Those who are fond of holding forth on international control may well be pleased: the work of the Eighteen Nation Committee will indeed proceed under broad and rigorous "international control" - under the control of the peoples.

The hopes of human beings are centred on preventing the outbreak of a new world war, the flames of which would devour whole countries. And these hopes are justifiably linked with general and complete disarmament, which is the common concern of all peoples and of all States, large and small. For this reason the Soviet Government expresses its satisfaction at the fact that this time, unlike in the past, States other than those belonging to opposing military alignments are also participating in the negotiations on disarmament.

The Eighteen Nation Committee can be said to be a sort of cross-section of the present-day world. All three main groups of States are represented here: the socialist countries, the States belonging to the military blocs of the Western Powers, and the neutralist countries. The Committee also incorporates the interests of the various geographical regions of the world.

Never before has there been a negotiating body for disarmament that was so fitted for the solution of the problem confronting it. The Committee is broad enough to be representative in the full sense of the word. At the same time it is narrow enough to act efficiently without getting stuck in the quagmire of endless discussions in which the vital cause of disarmament would be bogged down.

The Committee is starting its work in a situation characterized by certain favourable circumstances to which I have just referred. But, of course, they must not envelop in a golden-tissued veil the sinister omens looming on the horizon. No one can ignore the fact that a rather painful blow was inflicted on the negotiations in the Committee even before they had begun. Everybody, of course, realizes that I am referring to the decision of the United States Government to carry out a series of nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, beginning in the second half of April this year. And no matter what arguments may be put forward in justification, the United States Government cannot divest itself of the responsibility for the consequences of that decision.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

As the Soviet Government has already declared, if the United States and its allies add to the nuclear tests already conducted by them yet another series of nuclear tests in order to improve their nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union will be faced with the necessity of carrying out such tests of new types of its own nuclear weapons as may be required in these circumstances in order to strengthen its security and maintain peace.

The Soviet Government is convinced, as hitherto, that there exist all the necessary conditions for putting an end to nuclear weapons tests once and for all, if the United States, the United Kingdom and France display a sincere desire to do so and if they do not steer a course aimed at whipping up the nuclear arms race. The Soviet Union considers acceptable a decision to discontinue nuclear tests within the framework of general and complete disarmament or on the basis of a separate agreement, as was proposed by the Soviet Union on 28 November 1961.

This is not the first time that speeches on disarmament are being made in the Palais des Nations at Geneva. It is said that recently it was even necessary to replace the floor covering worn out by those who have "laboured" in the field of disarmament in various committees and sub-committees, commissions and sub-commissions. So far there has been no other practical result of these deliberations. It is true that there are also large piles of documents, but this has not advanced the cause of disarmament by a single inch. It is easy to understand the feeling of frustration evoked among the peoples by these unending talks around and about disarmament. It is the duty of governments that listen to the voice of the peoples and endeavour to meet their aspirations not to allow the Eighteen Nation Committee to share the inglorious fate of its predecessors.

What must the Committee's work end in, so that the participating governments can say with a clear conscience that they have really coped with the task assigned to them? Anyone who does not wish to prevaricate will give only one reply to this question - the work must lead to the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

Guided by the desire to make the negotiations practical and businesslike from the very outset, the Soviet Government has submitted for the Committee's consideration a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

Unlike previous drafts considered in the past under the aegis of the United Nations, this document is a real draft treaty, in which a programme for general and complete disarmament is set forth, article by article, paragraph by paragraph, in the precise language of binding provisions. This document encompasses the whole process of disarmament from beginning to end.

Our draft treaty is based on the principles of general and complete disarmament agreed upon by the USSR and the United States and approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its sixteenth session. At the same time, it takes into account many observations and wishes expressed in the past by other countries in regard to the programme for general and complete disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union.

The draft treaty prepared by the Soviet Government sets forth measures which, if fulfilled, will make it possible within a relatively short time to liquidate the entire military machinery of States, from rockets to rifles, from armies and divisions to general staffs. It provides for three clearly determined stages, each of which covers the specific obligations of States regarding disarmament and control. The purpose of these stages is to ensure the continuous and uninterrupted implementation of the whole disarmament programme and at the same time to create favourable conditions for the transfer of the economies of States to a peaceful basis.

Each party to the treaty on general and complete disarmament, when proceeding to carry out the treaty, must know everything it will have to do both at the beginning and at the end of the disarmament process. The stages are, so to speak, the steps of general and complete disarmament, and we want to build a sound staircase, so that we can firmly set our feet on each step, knowing that it will not collapse under our feet and that the world will not again plunge into the abyss of the arms race.

In this respect the Soviet draft differs favourably from other proposals which, although generally expressing agreement with the principle of carrying out general and complete disarmament in stages, in effect reduce the actual plans for disarmament to an enumeration of a few, and mainly very indefinite, measures of the first stage. As for the measures of the remaining stages, they are at best a vague outline which no one, including its authors, can decipher.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The implementation of the measures of the first stage set forth in the relevant articles of the Soviet draft treaty would practically eliminate the danger of an attack with nuclear weapons.

Just imagine that instead of being at the very start of the work of the Eighteen Nation Committee, we were already on the eve of the entry into force of a disarmament treaty. Then within less than two years all the means of delivering nuclear weapons would vanish from the face of the earth, and this means that the weapons themselves would be factually immobilized. There would be no military rockets or pilotless aircraft, and their launching pads, silos and platforms would be demolished. Even if rockets did fly, they would merely be the harbingers of science, probing the depths of the universe. Military aircraft capable of carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs would not be ploughing through the sky for they would have been destroyed. It would also be peaceful on the high seas: surface warships which could serve as nuclear weapon vehicles, and submarines would have been scrapped. The foreign military bases scattered over the territory of dozens of countries would remain only as dots on the maps charted by general staffs before the conclusion of the treaty on general and complete disarmament, while the bases themselves would no longer exist. The troops of any country would be stationed inside their own country, and not in foreign territories, as is the case today in regard to a number of countries. In addition, the strength of these troops would be considerably reduced; in particular, the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the United States would total no more than 1.7 million men.

It can hardly be denied that this picture, which is not derived from a science-fiction book, but fully corresponds to the specific and strict provisions of the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament proposed by the Soviet Government, greatly differs from what everyone can see today.

The implementation of the measures of the second stage of disarmament set forth in the draft treaty will ensure the prohibition of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction, together with the elimination of all stockpiles of these weapons and the cessation of their production. The threat of the outbreak of a thermo-nuclear war will be completely removed. A further considerable reduction of the armed forces of States will diminish the likelihood of armed

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

conflicts generally. I should like to draw attention to the fact that we are proposing that the armed forces of the USSR and the United States be reduced at this stage to one million men. This figure has been named by the United States itself, and for this reason there should be no difficulty in reaching agreement.

When all the armed forces and armaments of States have been eliminated and all military establishments abolished in the third stage, as provided for in articles 31-38 of the draft treaty, war will be practically banished from the life of human society.

The word "stage" may sound somewhat dull, but just think what a tremendous and really world-transforming content is injected into it in the Soviet draft treaty on general and complete disarmament. These are three historic landmarks on the steep path of mankind's ascent towards universal peace, well-being and progress.

On fine days, the snow-capped peak of Mont Blanc can be seen from Geneva. For a long time people thought it would remain unconquered. Yet the attack on that summit continued, and it was conquered. If disarmament is tackled properly, then that summit too, on which the aspirations of the peoples have been centred for ages, can be conquered in four years.

Disarmament measures in the Soviet draft treaty are arranged in stages in such a way that, both during the process of general and complete disarmament and after its completion, States will be in a position of equality in regard to the protection of their security and no one will obtain any kind of advantages. If other proposals with which the Committee is acquainted are examined from this point of view, it is obvious that they suffer from a one-sided approach. How, for example, can the destruction of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons be divorced from the dismantling of military bases on foreign territory and the withdrawal of troops from such territory? Does anyone believe that to follow a policy of calling on the other side to destroy its rockets, while you retain your own military bases on its frontiers amounts to disarmament? No, attempts to encroach upon the interests of the other side and to obtain a one-sided military advantage at its expense represent an unsound approach and cannot yield any satisfactory results. The Soviet Union is in favour of reasonable negotiations, honest disarmament and - if I may put it this way - honest co-operation in the solution of disarmament problems.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The Soviet Union wishes to have the necessary guarantees that the disarmament obligations that have been agreed upon will be strictly carried out and that there are no loopholes which will permit the clandestine production of aggressive armaments once the process of general and complete disarmament has begun. Our country does not intend to take anyone at his word, least of all States which have established closed military alignments, are pursuing a policy of building up armaments and have placed their military bases as close as possible to the Soviet Union. Nor do we expect others to take us at our word. The Soviet Union is a firm advocate of strict control over disarmament.

A study of the Soviet draft treaty makes it quite clear that, under the Soviet proposals, disarmament measures are coupled at each stage with reliable international control over their implementation. As N.S. Krushchev, the head of the Soviet Government, has repeatedly explained, the Soviet Union is ready to accept any proposals on control over disarmament put forward by the Western Powers if they will accept Soviet proposals on general and complete disarmament. This is the principle underlying the solution of problems relating to control in the draft treaty proposed by the Soviet Government.

Long before the work of the Committee of Eighteen began, a number of predictions started to appear in the Western Press to the effect that the Committee was bound to come up against difficulties on the problem of control. Of course, if instead of seeking progress towards agreement, a deliberate attempt is made to deepen the gulf which has hitherto divided the positions of the sides, then the Committee will certainly begin to falter from its very first steps. But if all participants in the Committee approach the problem of control over disarmament from unbiassed positions, adopt a straightforward attitude and do not attempt to substitute control over armaments for control over disarmament, then the problem of control is bound to find a solution.

It will scarcely be disputed that the best means of guaranteeing peace and the security of States is disarmament itself. When there are no armies and no armaments, no-one, as a matter of fact, will be in a position to precipitate a war, to use force in international relations or to threaten the use of force.

During previous negotiations certain States expressed the view that it would be desirable to take additional measures to safeguard security while general and complete disarmament is being implemented. This view does not differ from our own.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

Our draft Treaty provides for specific measures, including the setting up of armed forces to safeguard peace and the security of States both during the implementation of general and complete disarmament and after its completion. It is obvious that the establishment of institutions for the maintenance of the security of States can and should take place within the framework of the United Nations.

While the Soviet Government regards the preparation of an agreement on general and complete disarmament as the Committee's main task it would nevertheless consider it useful if a number of measures which would facilitate the relaxation of international tension, the strengthening of confidence among States and the creation of more favourable conditions for disarmament were taken forthwith, without awaiting the completion of the negotiations on general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet Union's proposals on such measures are contained in the Memorandum of the Soviet Government which was submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations on 26 September 1961. We note with satisfaction that the ideas contained in these proposals are finding increasing support. I need only mention in this connexion the proposal previously made by Poland and supported by Czechoslovakia for the establishment of an atom-free zone in Europe. Three of the four States which might form part of such a zone, namely, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, are prepared to carry this proposal into effect. If we further recall the proposal for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO, it will become abundantly clear how far agreement on such questions might improve the international situation and facilitate progress towards general and complete disarmament.

Discussion of specific measures to ease international tension should not, of course, deflect the Committee of Eighteen from its main concern. In order to prevent this from happening, discussion of such measures should proceed parallel with work on the treaty on general and complete disarmament, and without detriment to the principal task confronting the Committee.

Being anxious to facilitate the work of the Committee and to give the Governments represented on it an opportunity to gain a fuller and better understanding of the Soviet Union's position, the Soviet Government is submitting, in addition to the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control, a memorandum explaining the main provisions of the draft treaty.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

Each year and each month lost for disarmament do not mean merely marking time in the talks; they also mean a headlong sliding towards the red line that separates the world from the holocaust of a rocket-nuclear war. Indeed, while the talks on disarmament are proceeding the arms race goes on as before and, moreover, with ever-increasing gigantic strides, and the weapons of annihilation are becoming more and more lethal and destructive. If an attempt were made to visualize the mountain of armaments accumulated year after year by States, it would resemble an inverted pyramid with each new layer more massive than the previous one and holding an even greater stock of the means of destruction.

It would be a crime against humanity and against the conscience of the peoples, if the governments were to follow those groups which, though numerically small, strongly influence the policies of certain countries, and for which the arms race is merely a profitable business. But how squalid are these narrow interests compared to the stakes involved in the continuation of the arms race.

The production of armaments has now become a sort of continuously accelerating cycle which greedily sucks in ever bigger sectors of industry, agriculture, science and technology. Military aircraft, rockets, bombs, tanks, submarines and other means of exterminating human beings possess a highly attractive property in the eyes of those for whom armaments are a source of profit. They cannot be sold to the population, because no one has any need whatever for them, yet they are paid for out of the pockets of the taxpayers and, furthermore, they become obsolete the moment they see the light of day.

Today a powerful bomber of a certain type is built, and tomorrow a different bomber with a greater range, greater speed and greater carrying capacity is put on the production line. Where is the end of it all? Does mankind have to regard the arms race as some sort of robot before which it must fall on its knees? No, and no again, say all those who cherish peace, who hold dear the future of mankind: there is a sure and realistic way to be spared the dangerous consequences with which the arms race is fraught. This way lies in general and complete disarmament.

In wartime, lists used to be published of the casualties at the front. Yet no-one publishes the lists of the "cold war" casualties, the victims of the arms race. And they are countless. What electric computer can calculate how many people could have been saved from hunger and disease if but a part of the funds

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

expended on armaments had been diverted to the improvement of the living conditions in those countries which, through no fault of their own, lag many decades, or even centuries, behind the present-day levels of technology, education and medicine?

In considering the problem of disarmament in the Eighteen Nation Committee, we must constantly bear in mind that general and complete disarmament will release vast material resources, a certain proportion of which could be earmarked, as the Soviet Government proposes, for economic and technical assistance to the under-developed countries, for the elimination of their backwardness caused by the colonial exploitation of these countries. Such assistance would mean that the lofty principles of the United Nations, to which the governments of our States appended their signatures in 1945, do not remain hollow phrases, but are being embodied in a great and just cause.

General and complete disarmament, for which the Soviet Government is steadfastly calling, will consolidate the foundations of the peaceful co-existence of States and will make it indestructible. The sooner the States take this path, the sooner will come the day when there will be no room left for war.

Permit me in conclusion to express the hope that the members of the Committee, after impartially and carefully studying the draft treaty submitted today by the Soviet Government, will recognise the need to make it the basis of the Committee's work. The Soviet Government, as it has already stated, is ready to do its utmost to ensure the success of the negotiations and to justify the expectations of the peoples that hinge on the work of the Eighteen Nation Committee.

Mr. RUSK (United States of America): I am happy to have the opportunity to meet in this hall with the Foreign Ministers and principal representatives of the countries participating in this Conference.

I bring you greetings from the President of the United States, and the most sincere good wishes of the American people for the success of our work.

I should like to open my remarks by reading a letter which the President has just sent to me:

"As you and your colleagues from every quarter of the globe enter upon the work of the Geneva Disarmament Conference, it may seem unnecessary to state again that the hopes and indeed the very prospects of mankind are engaged. And yet the fact that the immediate and practical significance of the task that has brought you together has come to be so fully realized by the peoples of the world is one of the crucial developments of our time. For men now know that amassing of destructive power does not beget security; they know that polemics do not bring peace. Men's minds, men's hearts, and men's spiritual aspirations alike demand no less than a reversal of the course of recent history — a replacement of ever-growing stockpiles of destruction by ever-growing opportunities for human achievement. It is your task as representative of the United States to join with your colleagues in a supreme effort toward that end.

"This task, the foremost item on the agenda of humanity, is not a quick or easy one. It must be approached both boldly and responsibly. It is a task whose magnitude and urgency justifies our bringing to bear upon it the highest resources of creative statesmanship the international community has to offer, for it is the future of the community of mankind that is involved. We must pledge ourselves at the outset to an unceasing effort to continue until the job is done. We must not be discouraged by initial disagreements nor weakened in our resolve by the tensions that surround us and add difficulties to our task. For verifiable disarmament arrangements are not a fair weather phenomenon. A sea wall is not needed when the seas are calm. Sound disarmament agreements, deeply rooted in mankind's mutual interest in survival, must serve as a bulwark against the tidal waves of war and its destructiveness. Let no one, then, say that we cannot arrive at such agreements in troubled times, for it is then their need is greatest.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

"My earnest hope is that no effort will be spared to define areas of agreement on all of the three important levels to which Prime Minister Macmillan and I referred in our joint letter of 7 February to Premier Khrushchev. Building upon the principles already agreed, I hope that you will quickly be able to report agreement on an outline defining the overall shape of a programme for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. I have submitted such an outline on behalf of the United States to the United Nations General Assembly last September. But an outline is not enough. You should seek as well, as areas of agreement emerge, a definition in specific terms of measures set forth in the outline. The objective should be to define in treaty terms the widest area of agreement that can be implemented at the earliest possible time while still continuing your maximum efforts to achieve agreement on those other aspects which present more difficulty. As a third specific objective you should seek to isolate and identify initial measures of disarmament which could, if put into effect without delay, materially improve international security and the prospects for further disarmament progress. In this category you should seek as a matter of highest priority agreement on a safeguarded nuclear test ban. At this juncture in history no single measure in the field of disarmament would be more productive of concrete benefit in the alleviation of tensions and the enhancement of prospects for greater progress.

"Please convey, on my behalf and on behalf of the people of the United States, to the representatives of the nations assembled, our deep and abiding support of the deliberations on which you are about to embark. I pledge anew my personal and continuing interest in this work."

All of us will agree, I am sure, that this Conference faces one of the most perplexing and urgent tasks on the agenda of man. In this endeavour we welcome our association with representatives from countries which have not previously been intimately involved with earlier negotiations on disarmament. The dreary history of such negotiations shows that we need their help and fresh points of view. The presence of these delegations reminds us too that arms races are not the exclusive concern of the great Powers. Countries situated in every region of the world are confronted with their own conflicts and tensions, and some are engaged in arms competition. We are not here dealing solely with a single struggle in which a

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

few large States are engaged, with the rest of the world as spectators. Every State has a contribution to make in establishing the conditions for general disarmament in its own way. Every State has a responsibility to strive for a reduction of tension and of armaments in its own neighbourhood. This means that each of us will bear personal responsibility for what we do here. Every speech and every act must move us toward our common objective. At the same time, every one of us brings to the search for disarmament a separate fund of experience relevant to our problem. The United States, for example, has established a major new agency of government to mobilise our skills and resources to seek out and study every useful approach to arms reduction.

What is needed is immediate reduction and eventual elimination of all the national armaments and armed forces required for making war. What is required most urgently is to stop the nuclear arms race. All of us recognize that this moment is critical. We are here because we share the conviction that the arms race is dangerous and that every tool of statecraft must be used to end it. As the President said on 2 March, the United States is convinced that "in the long run, the only real security in this age of nuclear peril rests not in armaments but in disarmament".

Modern weapons have a quality new to history. A single thermonuclear weapon today can carry the explosive power of all the weapons of the last war. In the last war they were delivered at 300 miles an hour; today they travel at almost 300 miles a minute. Economic costs skyrocket through sophistication of design and by accelerating rates of obsolescence.

Our objective, therefore, is clear enough. We must eliminate the instruments of destruction. We must prevent the outbreak of war by accident or by design. We must create the conditions for a secure and peaceful world. In so doing, we can turn the momentum of science exclusively to peaceful purposes, and we can lift the burden of the arms race and thus increase our capacity to raise living standards everywhere.

A group of experts meeting at the United Nations has just issued an impressive report on the economic and social consequences of disarmament which should stimulate us in our work. The experts, drawn from countries with the most diverse political systems, were unanimously of the opinion that the problems of transition

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

connected with disarmament could be solved to the benefit of all countries and that disarmament would lead to the improvement of world economic and social conditions. They characterized the achievement of general and complete disarmament as an unqualified blessing to all mankind.

This is the spirit in which we in the United States would deal with the economic readjustments required if we should achieve broad and deep cuts in the level of armaments. The United States too is a nation with vast unfinished business. Disarmament would permit us to get on with the job of building a better America and, through expanded economic development activities, of building a better world. The great promise of man's capacity should not be frustrated by his inability to deal with war and implements of war. Man is an inventive being; surely we can turn our hands and minds at long last to the task of the political invention we need to repeal the law of the jungle.

How can we move towards such disarmament?

The American people bear arms through necessity, not by choice. Emerging from World War II in a uniquely powerful military position, the United States demobilized its armed strength and made persistent efforts to place under international control the use of atomic energy, then an American monopoly. The fact that the story of the postwar period has forced increased defence efforts upon us is a most grievous disappointment. This disappointment teaches us that reduction of tensions must go hand in hand with real progress in disarmament. We must, I believe, work simultaneously at both. On the one hand, it is idle to expect that we can move very far down the road toward disarmament if all who claim to want it do not seek as well to relax tensions and create conditions of trust. Confidence cannot be built on a footing of threats and polemics and disturbed relations. On the other hand, by reducing and finally eliminating means of military intimidation we might render our political crises less acutely dangerous and provide greater scope for their settlement by peaceful means.

I would be less than candid if I did not point out the harmful effect which deliberately stimulated crises can have on our work here. In the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations published on 20 September 1961 the United States and the Soviet Union affirmed that:

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

"to facilitate the attainment of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world it is important that all States abide by existing international agreements, refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and that they seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means." (A/4879, page 3)

Yet we are confronted by crises which inevitably cast their shadows into this meeting room.

The same can be said for the failure of our efforts, so hopefully begun, to conclude an effective agreement for ending nuclear weapon tests.

There is an obvious lesson to be drawn from these considerations. The lesson is that general and complete disarmament must be accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. For the rule and spirit of law must prevail if the world is to be disarmed. As we make progress in this Conference, we shall have to lay increasing stress on this point. A disarmed world must be a law-abiding world in which a United Nations peace force can cope with international breaches of the peace. In the words of the Joint Statement:

"Progress in disarmament should be accompanied by measures to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means." (A/4879, page 5)

Fortunately, there is a sign which can give us hope that this Conference will in good time lay the foundation stones for a world without war.

For the first time, a disarmament conference is beginning its activities within an agreed framework -- the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles -- which all our governments have welcomed along with every other Member of the United Nations. The United States considers the Joint Statement as its point of departure. Our objective is to build on that foundation and to give practical application to the principles.

The United States programme for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, introduced in the United Nations on 25 September 1961, was presented to give life to the Agreed Principles. It is comprehensive in its scope and in its description of the subjects suitable for action in the first and subsequent stages of the disarmament process. It is framed so as to avoid impairment of

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

the security of any State. It aims at balanced and verified disarmament in successive stages. It is not immutable, however. It is designed to serve as a basis for negotiation.

This Conference also has before it another plan, presented by the Soviet Union. A comparison of the two plans will show some areas of agreement. We believe it is the task of the Conference to search for broader areas of accord leading to specific steps which all can take with confidence.

At this meeting the United States wishes to put forward some suggestions and proposals regarding the course of our future activity. First as to objective and procedure; then as to a programme of work for the Conference.

We believe that the ultimate objective should be the working out in detail of a treaty or treaties putting into effect an agreed programme for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. To bring this about we propose that all of our delegations agree to continue our efforts at this Conference without interruptions, other than those we all agree to be desirable or necessary for our task, until a total programme for general and complete disarmament has been achieved.

As for procedures, we propose that we find means of achieving maximum informality and flexibility. We do not believe that the best way to make progress is to concentrate our time and efforts in protracted or sterile debate. Accordingly, the United States will propose that as soon as ample opportunity has been allowed for opening statements the schedule of plenary meetings be reduced, so that issues and problems can be explored in informal meetings and in sub-committees more likely to produce agreement.

Let me turn now to proposals regarding the work of the Conference.

The first proposal is that the Conference work out and agree on an outline programme of general and complete disarmament which can be included in the report due to the United Nations Disarmament Commission by 1 June. The United States believes that to fulfil this first objective the initial aim of the Conference should be to consolidate and expand the areas of agreement and to reconcile the differences between the United States and Soviet disarmament plans. This should result in working out a single programme of general and complete disarmament which all could support. This agreed programme might well take the

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

form of a joint declaration which could be presented to the United Nations by all the States represented here. Such a programme could be a framework for the treaty or treaties which would put the agreed total programme into effect.

But, of course, our aims must be more ambitious than this.

We should begin at once to fill in the outline of the total programme. Wherever possible, we should seek specific commitments that could be put into effect without delay. This need not await agreement on the outline as a whole. Nor should it impede the development of an overall programme. Wherever the common interest permits, we can and should put into effect defined, specific steps as quickly as possible.

As a first step toward filling in the details of such a programme, the United States makes the following proposals:

One: We propose that a cut of 30 per cent in nuclear delivery vehicles and major conventional armaments be included in the first stage of the disarmament programme. We propose that strategic delivery vehicles be reduced not only in numbers but also in destructive capability. We estimate that, given faithful co-operation, this reduction might be carried out in three years. Similar reductions can, we believe, be achieved in each of the later stages. It is recognized, however, that, in the words of the Agreed Principles:

"All measures of general and complete disarmament should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any State or group of States gain military advantage and that security is insured equally for all." (A/4879, page 4)

But agreement on such a reduction and the measures to carry it out would be a significant step forward. It would reverse the upward spiral of the arms race, replacing increases with decreases. And men could begin to gain freedom from the fear of mass destruction from such weapons.

Two: The United States has proposed that early in the first stage further production of any fissionable material for nuclear weapons use be stopped. We propose now that thereafter the United States and the USSR each agree to transfer in the first stage 50,000 kilograms of weapons grade U-235 to non-weapons purposes. Such a move would cut at the heart of nuclear weapons production. The initial transfers should be followed by additional transfers in the subsequent stages of the disarmament programme. Resources now devoted to military programmes could then be employed for purposes of peace.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

Three: The United States proposes that the disarmament programme also include early action on specific world-wide measures which will reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, failure of communications, or surprise attack. These are measures which can be worked out rapidly. They are bound to increase confidence. They will reduce the likelihood of war.

We will be prepared to present concrete proposals for action in the following areas:

- A. Advance notification of military movements, such as major transfers of forces, exercises and manoeuvres, and flights of aircraft, as well as firing of missiles.
- B. Establishment of observation posts at major ports, railway centres, motor highways, river crossings and air bases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces.
- C. Establishment of aerial inspection areas and the use of mobile inspection teams to improve protection against surprise attack.
- D. Establishment of an International Commission on Measures to Reduce the Risk of War, charged with the task of examining objectively the technical problems involved.

Four: The United States proposes that the participants in this Conference undertake an urgent search for mutually acceptable methods of guaranteeing the fulfilment of obligations for arms reduction. We shall look with sympathy on any approach which shows promise of leading to progress without sacrificing safety.

We must not be diverted from this search by shop-worn efforts to equate verification with espionage. Such an abortive attempt misses the vital point in verification procedures. No government, large or small, could be expected to enter into disarmament arrangements under which their peoples might become victims of the perfidy of others.

In other affairs, accounting and auditing systems are customarily installed so that the question of confidence need not arise. Confidence grows out of knowledge; suspicion and fear are rooted in ignorance. This has been true since the beginning of time.

Let me make this point clear: the United States does not ask for inspection for inspection's sake. Inspection is for no purpose other than assurance that

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

commitments are fulfilled. The United States will do what is necessary to assure others that it has fulfilled its commitments. We would find it difficult to understand why others cannot do the same. We will settle for any reasonable arrangement which gives assurances commensurate with the risks. We do not ask a degree of inspection out of line with the amount and kind of disarmament actually undertaken. Our aim is prudent precaution, in the interest of the security of us all, and nothing else.

We are prepared jointly to explore various means through which this could be done. It might be possible in certain instances to use sampling techniques in which verification could take place in some predetermined fashion, perhaps in specific geographic areas, thus subjecting any violator of a disarmament agreement to a restraining risk of exposure without maintaining constant surveillance everywhere. This is, I repeat, one example of ways in which recent progress in verification techniques can be adapted to the needs of participating States. We would hope that this Conference would make a thorough study of every practicable method of effective verification.

The four proposals I have just described are new and realistic examples of the specific measures which we contemplated in the first stage of the United States plan of 25 September. We can recall that that plan had other specific proposals:

- that the Soviet Union and the United States reduce their force levels by many hundreds of thousands of men to a total of 2,100,000 for each.
- that steps be taken to prevent States owning nuclear weapons from relinquishing control of such weapons to any nation not owning them.
- that weapons capable of producing mass destruction should not be placed in orbit or stationed in outer space.

Finally, we call for early action on a matter that should yield priority to none — the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. Here we stand at a turning point. If a treaty cannot be signed, and signed quickly, to do away with nuclear weapon testing with appropriate arrangements for detection and verification, there will be further tests and the spiral of competition will continue upward. But if we can reach such an agreement this development can be stopped, and stopped forever. This is why the United States and the United Kingdom have invited the Soviet Union to resume negotiations to ban all nuclear weapons tests under effective international controls. We shall press this matter here at Geneva and make every reasonable effort to conclude an agreement which can bring an end to testing.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

I had expected that a number of representatives might express here their regrets that the Soviet Union and the United States had resumed nuclear testing. But I had supposed that there was one delegation -- that of the Soviet Union -- which could not have found it possible to criticize the United States for doing so.

The representatives of the Soviet Union have spoken of the possible effect of United States weapons testing on this Conference. The Statement of Agreed Principles and this Conference were born amid the echoing roars of more than forty Soviet nuclear explosions. A fifty-megaton bomb does not make the noise of a cooing dove.

Despite the Soviet tests of last autumn, nuclear weapons testing can stop -- now and for ever.

The Soviet Union has spoken of its readiness to accept inspection of disarmament, though not of armament. We hope that it will agree that the total, permanent elimination of nuclear testing is disarmament, and will accept effective international controls within its own formula.

I have presented United States proposals for early disarmament action in this Conference. We shall have further suggestions and so, I am sure, will others. The Conference will need to single out those points it regards as most susceptible of useful treatment, or most pressing in terms of the common danger, and to take them up at once.

We believe that as soon as agreement is reached on the specific measures to be included in the first stage we can develop the specific steps for the second and third stages. In these stages further reductions of armaments will move hand in hand with the strengthening of international institutions for the maintenance of peace.

Our plan of work must achieve what this Conference is charged to do in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles. Let us define the overall shape of the programme. Let us develop in more detail the component parts which must be fitted together within the programme and let us do as much as we can as fast as we can.

Let us then apply ourselves to the task of this Conference soberly and systematically and realistically. Let the need for disarmament provide the momentum for our work. Let us follow every promising path which might lead to progress. Let us with all deliberate speed reach a consensus on what can be done first and on what should be undertaken on a continuing basis.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

And let us not permit this Conference, like its predecessors, to become frozen in deadlock at the start of its deliberations. Surely it need not do so. The obstacles to disarmament agreements — the forces tending to divide us into rival aggregations of power — might at long last begin to yield to the overriding and shared interest in survival which alone can unite us for peace.

The CHAIRMAN (Canada): There are no further speakers for today, and we now have to consider the communique to the Press.

The Conference decided to issue the following communique:

"The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament held today its second meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Howard Green, Secretary of State for External Affairs and representative of Canada.

"The representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America made statements.

"The Soviet delegation submitted the draft of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control, and a Memorandum of the Soviet Government on the disarmament negotiations in the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Friday, 16 March 1962, at 10 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.